

CADASTRAL REFERENCE WORKGROUP MEETING NOTES
January 30, 2009
9:00 – 11:30 a.m. MST

Meeting convened at 9:00 a.m.

| Name | Organization |
|---------------------|--|
| Donna Pitzer | Reclamation, Co-lead for the Cadastral Reference group |
| Jeff Servatius | Idaho State Tax Commission |
| Dave Short | Ch2M Hill |
| Renee Bettis | Dept. of Lands |
| Jack Clark | Ada County Assessor's Office |
| Kevin De Rossett | BLM |
| Sarah Higvera | Canyon Co. |
| Mike Bruse | Canyon Co |
| Gary Wilbert | Idaho Power |
| Anne Kawalec | Ada County Assessor's Office |
| Walt Bulawa | ISTC |
| Bob Smith | OCIO |
| Craig Rindlisbacher | Madison County/City of Rexburg |
| Scott Van Hoff | USGS |
| By Phone | |
| Stewart Ward | Dioptera |
| Greg Harbeson | Galena Engineering |
| Ben Knott | Premier Data Services |
| Bob Ader | BLM/Co-chair of FGDC subcommittee for Cadastral Data |
| Angela Vander Pass | Clearwater County |
| Nancy Von Meyer | FGDC/Fairview Industries |
| Marc Thomas | FGDC/Fairview Industries |

Announcement about Sheldon Bluestein taking a new job in San Francisco. Donna and Craig are the new co-leads for the Cadastral Reference group and Anne Kawalec and Jeff Servatius are the co-leads for the parcels group.

Review of results from the County parcels inventory as it relates to the GCDB group.

The question on the inventory was, “What cadastral fabric do you use to create your parcel layer?” 22 counties state that they use GCDB, 2 use local control, 11 were either blank or not understandable, and 4 state that they use a mix of local control and the GCDB. Clear that the majority of counties use the GCDB for their mapping. Walt stated that the inventory answers didn’t give a clear indication whether the counties have done their own adjusting of the GCDB and use their own adjusted layer for mapping. We may need to try to ascertain that information at a later time if possible.

Update on the GCDB enhancement pilot project.

Action item – Donna will post map of pilot project area on the website.

BLM, Reclamation and Premier data are working on a pilot project in the eastern part of the state, namely a 6 township area encompassing Madison, Freemont and Teton counties. The project objective is to do a complete GCDB adjustment process in this area. Reclamation has provided some control points; Jeff Williamson (Mountain River Engineering) has provided a good deal of other control in Freemont County. Bob Ader with BLM in Denver has provided \$5,000.00 and Reclamation will provide \$5,000.00 towards the project. Ben Knott with Premier Data stated that in addition to those 6 townships you will see some adjustment to the surrounding townships as they need to be incorporated into the process for adjustment. The townships in this area are PCCS townships which will first need to be converted to GMM townships and then the new control will be incorporated.

Donna's goal for this project is the ability of being able to clearly demonstrate the enormous gains in data quality that this process provides. Parcels will also have to be adjusted to show the extended advantage of having this done. Once the details have been ironed out and all materials are available, Ben states that it would take 6 weeks to complete the project.

Action item – Donna has to get in touch with Bob Ader for final contracting details to get Reclamation money committed to the process.

Condition of Survey (COS) maps

This project is being funded solely by BLM with Premier Data as the contractor. Bob Ader asks if the group is interested in the whole State or just the pilot area. Donna said the entire state because this group needs to make some decisions about where to invest dollars and resources. In order to prioritize, it is important that we know the condition of the GCDB throughout the State.

Ben explained that they have 6 guiding principles or layers that they are comingling with the GCDB reliability information that shows the spatial accuracy of the GCDB.

Composite maps are created that shows where the GCDB is weakest based on BLM standards and criteria. Bob Ader states that once those layers are created, they could be combined with other information that might be of priority concern for other agencies.

Donna states that it would be helpful to see some examples of what is being produced so that we have an idea of what the product looks like. Bob Ader approved of example maps being shared with the group. Ben agreed to send an example to Donna.

Tom asked if BLM had the funding to complete the COS for the entire state and Bob Ader confirmed that they do.

Tom asked about whether the difference between PCCS and GMM township information will be provided in these COS maps. Ben responded that information is not an integral part of the COS project, but that can be provided as a separate product.

Action item – Ben will send example COS information to Donna. And he will work with his production manager to finalize the schedule for completion of that State.

Bob Ader stated that there is some potential to get some stimulus money for PLSS data improvement.

Bob Ader stated that there will be a parcel cap grant monies available for next year.

Control Point Database

Marc Thomas presented an example of a control point database in Hood River County in Oregon.

The application as originally built in Wisconsin with counties in mind. Not originally conceived for GCDB enhancement, but can be useful for that purpose.

The county surveyor is the Steward of these points by statute even though a point may have been collected by a GCDB surveyor. They are only responsible for private information not public information.

The accuracy statement is the best estimate of the accuracy based on output from GMM and professional judgment of the collector.

Can display one or more coordinates for the same point. Must have a Steward and that Steward has to make the decision on which point is more accurate.

The system needs to be styled to help both the county and federal agencies. Nancy states that they are working on a spreadsheet upload utility whereby the surveyors dump from their systems and do a batch upload of their data.

Craig asked if only licensed surveyors can submit information. Marc replied that it is up to the Steward of the system to decide. *Craig – is there a standard? Also Steward dependent on who has the right to upload data. Some basic standards*

Nancy – the intention of the program is to be an index of what is available and to harvest as much as possible. Experience is that initial enthusiasm of collecting every detail of a point soon wanes in the reality of getting surveyors to provide that information.

Recommend that everything that comes in gets classified as informational and then the Steward decides on what becomes the active coordinate. Or classified as proposed control and then reviewed and reclassified appropriately.

Stewart Ward of Diptera stated that their data is available to everyone and their philosophy is that monuments are public and the information associated with those monuments is also public

Action item – contact Stewart and see if he can be involved in piloting the CPD.

There is a great deal of public survey information available even if other private surveyors don't contribute.

Recommendation - Consider an attribute is needed to ascertain whether the point is photo identifiable.

Some customers do not want special survey points or meander lines shown in the database as they would not be used for control. Neither would a subdivision corner even

though it has been GPS'd. They can be displayed but would have to be attributed accordingly.

Deployed in Michigan, Utah, Colorado, Mississippi, Montana.

Donna – what are the things we need to know to get started if we would decide to pursue this project?

Nancy – look at the database structure and determine how your information is going to get uploaded into the SQL Server database. Uploading would work much easier if they could assist.

Review the National Point ID standard and either adopt or develop our own and adopt. Discussion on what to do with porcupine corners. Those corners that have either been monumented or documented as representing the same corner but occupy different coordinates. Some decision has to be made by some recognized body and then once that decision is made, the selected corner becomes active. What happens to the other corners in the database needs to be worked out. Delete or not.

In most deployments, start with the GCDB data as informational information and then tie all new information to the GCDB point identifier.

Is that available from BLM? Tom states that he would like to see this as a true control database. BLM has two sets of data – one is digitized control and one is true control and Tom would like to contribute only the true control.

Can we just get the GCDB point identifier structure but only have the true control coordinates entered in the database.

Ben Knott and Karen Holt can assist with data upload with the FME extension.

Nancy - \$1000 to install the interface on our server or could donate to the cause. They could also stand up a site on their development server for a limited amount of time. The interface is available with open code so someone else could customize.

Are there any specifications for the server? Not sure, but should run on any decent server.

Craig states that most Records of Survey and CP&Fs filed do not contain or display any coordinate values. Have other states legislated a requirement for surveyors to include coordinates on these records?

Bob – Utah received some pass through dollars from Congress that was used as seed money to get State legislation passed providing funding to contract private surveyors to collect points. The contracts required that the data be delivered in a standard format. 20-50K to each county for a couple of years.

Control survey is different from a subdivision survey or boundary survey.

Nancy said she would provide an Access geodatabase and Stewart agreed to be the test subject and look and see what it would take to populate that database.

Nancy asked Bob if they should go ahead and stand up a development project so that we can test out the system and the process. Bob said yes.

Working with Ben and Tom, we can generate point identifiers for a small portion of the State.

The group agreed that work on a demonstration project should proceed.

Action item – provide urls for the Hood River County site

Action item – Nancy and Marc will send badger site for exploration. This site can be accessed for editing without harming any production data.

No final business to report

Next meeting scheduled for February 27, 9:00-11:30

Meeting adjourned 11:30 a.m.